

## REMARKS

The specification was amended to correct a typographical error, and to reduce the number of words in the Abstract.

Certain claims were voluntarily amended to remove the phrase "may be". As this was not an amendment made for a reason related to patentability, the full scope of equivalents for these claims should remain intact.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) based on Matsuda et al. (US2002/0133573), Funk et al. (US 5,937,162) and Perlman et al. (US 5,128,926) for the reasons of record. These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

As is apparent from the description of the service discovery functionality of the Networked Office Appliance (NOA) architecture of Matsuda et al., beginning in paragraph 0083, they use a SNOA server that is simply a combination of a HTTP daemon and a program that issues HTTP queries. The result is the Service List shown in paragraphs 0086-0094. The purpose, as is stated in paragraphs 0034-0036, is to detect existing DNS and DHCP services on a network and, if none are discovered, for the NOA device to startup as a server to provide these services to the network.

In order to even more succinctly distinguish the teachings of Matsuda et al. from the claims of this patent application, each of the independent claims has been amended to specifically recite that the:

"plurality of network configuration discovery protocols are executed sequentially in a hierarchical manner and organized so as to first execute a network configuration discovery protocol expected to provide most comprehensive network configuration information, followed by a network configuration discovery protocol expected to provide next most comprehensive network configuration information".

Support for this amendment, as well as the amendment to claim 4, can be found at least at page

19, lines 12-20, of the specification as filed. No new matter is added by this amendment.

There is no similar teaching or suggestion in Matsuda et al., and this amendment thus serves to even further patentably distinguish the independent claims from NOA architected system of Matsuda et al. In that claims 1 and 10 are all clearly patentable over Matsuda et al. then the dependent claims are all patentable as well, whether or not considered further in view of the disclosures of Funk et al. and/or Perlman et al. The addition of possible location object in a persistent database, as in Perlman et al., does not cure the defect in the disclosure of Matsuda et al., and independent claim 16 should be found to be patentable as well.

Still further in this regard, and by example, the Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 11 as being anticipated by Matsuda et al. However, a word search of Matsuda et al. does not find any mention of the claimed Salutation protocol, or of the claimed LDAP protocol. This being the case, Matsuda et al. cannot anticipate claims 2 and 11, or for that matter claims 5 and 13 where a specific sequence of service discovery protocols are called out, including the Salutation and LDAP protocols. The addition of Perlman et al. does not cure this problem for claims 17 and 20, as these claimed protocols are not found in Perlman either.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) based on Matsuda et al., Funk et al. and/or Perlman et al., and to allow all of the pending claims 1-20 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.